

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/777,378	02/06/2001	Hiroaki Kitamoto	Kanzaki Case 161	8381		
75	590 04/23/2003					
FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.			EXAMINER			
2026 Rambling Kalamazoo, MI			NASH, B	NASH, BRIAN D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3721	8		
			DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>6</del>			
	09/777,378	KITAMOTO, HIROA	KI			
Advisory Action			1			
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brian D Nash	3721	<u> </u>			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	iress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ly to a ation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION.	ion. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apportion or in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the						
issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without canceli</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	is.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment			
<ul> <li>5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting the application in condition for allowance b</li> <li>6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</li> </ul>	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		•			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exam	iner.			
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer			1			
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Vendefole	,			
	Su	Rinaldi I. Rada pervisory Patent Ex Group 3700				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends, inter alia, that Spatz et al does not disclose the same process as the claimed invention. Examiner acknowledges applicant's position; however, a reference is deemed to properly anticipate a claim when all the recited limitations and/or process steps are disclosed therein. In this instance, Spatz et al shows all the recited limitations and process steps including (see Paper No. 6, paragraph 4).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (i.e. Spatz et al in view of Humphries et al and/or in view of Barca), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In this case, Humphries et al teaches disengagement of a screw cap via rotating the cap in an opposite direction. Barca teaches measuring axial load on the cap and rotation of the cap while descending the cap upon the container.

For the reasons above, the grounds for rejection are deemed proper. .